

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action dated February 28, 2007 and the references cited therein. In response thereto, claims 23-25 are amended; claims 1-22 and 26 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 27-31 are added. As a result, claims 23-25 and 27-31 are pending in the present application.

Objected Claims

Claims 24-26 are objected to because of some informalities. Claims 24-25 are amended to overcome the objection, and claim 26 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henson. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson in view of Hanzek and still further in view of Thompson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons below.

Claim 23 is amended to recite a method in a computerized system for building a custom specification and a quote for purchasing a piece of equipment by a potential customer from a salesperson in a transaction therebetween, comprising: providing at least one pre-engineered specification to at least one of the potential customer and the salesperson, wherein the pre-engineered specification is a specification for one or more designs of a component for which existing designs have been completed; displaying the at least one pre-engineered specification for the equipment; electronically soliciting from the at least one of the potential customer and the salesperson a selection of one of the at least one pre-engineered specification; electronically soliciting from the at least one of the potential customer and the salesperson a manufacturer of one component of the equipment; displaying options and prices for the component and allowing the at least one of the potential customer and the salesperson to select at least one option for the component, wherein the displaying options and prices includes updating the displayed options and prices after an interrelated option has been selected; generating a report showing the options selected for the component and a subtotal cost for the component; and generating a report showing the components selected and the total cost of the equipment.

Henson discloses a web-based online store. Henson does not disclose or teach a method of building a custom specification and a quote for purchasing a piece of equipment by a potential customer from a salesperson in a transaction therebetween as recited in claim 23. The claimed invention relates to a purchasing and/or leasing transaction of a piece of equipment between a potential customer and a salesperson who frequently is not an engineer skilled in the design of

the equipment (see Background section of the present invention, e.g. pages 2-3 of the present application). The claimed invention allows the potential customer and/or salesperson to obtain pre-engineered specifications that will meet almost any potential customer's need, thus limiting the time required for the salesperson to work with each customer to select options. Reducing the time the salesperson spends with each customer in this manner may allow the salesperson time for more customer contracts, quicker quote generation for each customer, and thus more sales (see at least lines 14-18, page 21 of the present application). Henson does not suggest or teach a method of building a custom specification and a quote for purchasing or leasing a piece of equipment by a potential customer from a salesperson in a transaction therebetween. To the contrary, Henson's system is merely a web-based online store having a configurator, a cart, a checkout, and a database, further in which a user interface of the online store (see at least the Abstract of Henson). In addition, Henson does not appreciate, nor does it provide any solutions, to the problems addressed in the background of the present invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 patentably distinguishes over Henson.

Claim 24 also recites the features discussed above and therefore is patentable over Henson. Claims 25 and 27-31 which are dependent from claim 24 are also patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

None of the other cited references remedy the deficiencies of Henson. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23-25 and 27-31 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

This response is being submitted on or before June 28, 2007, making this a timely response. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fee of \$120.00 for a one-month extension of time to Deposit Account 04-1420. It is believed that no additional fees are due in connection with this filing. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension fees or other relief which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 04-1420.


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application and a favorable response are respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues, please contact the undersigned at (612) 752-7367.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date: May 31, 2007

By: 
Min (Amy) S. Xu
Reg. No. 39,536